

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 25, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

In point (A) of the Response to Arguments section, the examiner argues that edge routers and border routers as taught by Rawlins perform processing operations. While it might be said abstractly that a router does “processing”, a fair reading of each claim as a whole precludes any finding that the routers in Rawlins anticipate the recited processing components for providing a plurality of virtual processing elements that are accessible by respective network traffic paths to perform a respective processing operation. As recited in claim 1, the virtual processing elements are allocable in order to complete respective data processing operations. As known in the art and as apparent from Rawlins itself, routers do not perform processing that meets these requirements. The “processing” done in a router is for the purpose of getting each particular packet of network traffic to its proper destination. The router does not perform any operations on the data within the packet (i.e., the payload); therefore, there is no “processing operation” as defined in the claims. Furthermore, the processing done by a router to properly forward a packet does not utilize resources in the router which are addressable or identifiable to users in the network so that they could be allocated for any other use. Consequently, Rawlins fails to teach the virtual processing elements having the recited characteristics.

In point (B), the examiner argues that quality of service and bandwidth reservation used by Rawlins demonstrate that the elements in Rawlins do something other than pass traffic between a source and destination. In actuality, these functions likewise have for their purpose to facilitate the movement of packets to their destinations. Interaction that may occur between routers is not equivalent to the claimed data processing transactions.

In point (C), the examiner argues that applicant’s previous arguments relied on

features not in the claims. It is respectfully pointed out that claim 1, lines 6-7, recite “representing a pool of said virtual processing elements using a resource aggregator.” Thus, applicants arguments are commensurate with the claims.

In point (D), the examiner argues that applicant’s previous arguments relied on features not in the claims. It is respectfully pointed out that claim 3, lines 1-3, recite “pool includes composite resource sets combining said respective processing operations to implement a predetermined composite service,” and that claim 4, lines 1-3, recite that the “respective processing operations within a composite resource set are characterized by predetermined interactions for integrating said processing operations into a service function.” Thus, applicants arguments are commensurate with the claims.

Since Rawlins does not teach every aspect of any of claims 1-7, 10-13, or 16-20, it fails to anticipate them. Likewise, Rawlins fails to support the obviousness rejections of claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 21, or 22.

In view of the foregoing remarks, claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark L. Mollon/
Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: April 24, 2008
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)